

Charles Vuong

90	Fidi Jimenez - ModernBrain		
	FLIGHT: A		
	Open LD - Sat 10/26 Pattern A Round 4 - 3:30PM		
Room: E3 521	2019 SCJFL 1st Quarter Debate Only Tournament		
ASAP			
Affirmative: Academy of Higher Learning TH		Negative: Nova 42 Academy AP	
<u>Name</u>	<u>PTS (100-70)</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>PTS (100-70)</u>
Timothy Ha	<u>92</u>	Andy Pan	<u>93</u>
Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.		Low Point Win? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<u>Charles Vuong</u>		<u>Modern Brain</u>	
JUDGE'S SIGNATURE		JUDGE'S AFFILIATION	

- SAT - put an end to them
- biased towards rich students
↳ Against Black/Latino students
- Economic inequality
- underestimates women's performance in college
- lose 19350 ^{per} annually
- ~~use~~ GPA as alternative

VALUE: ^{Quality:} Value of Democracy

REF: ^{flawed} Neg's points, were deconstructed by Aff in the end and Aff's reformation of points were very strong

- will harm USA - dropouts cost us 360 billion
- Health/Life
- School GPA IS BIASED, Inflation
- Teacher Bias
- The tests assess math & science skills
- Strongly predicts college performance
- College graduates: higher quality
- Drop outs: lower quality of life
- will look at students other life factors to reduce bias
- more women going to college than men 2015

VALUE: Quality of Life

- GPA more biased than SAT
- Social welfare
- Logic: wealthy parents don't & can't take kids to extracurriculars & program

97

Rhinell Navarro - ELAC

FLIGHT: A

Open LD - Sat 10/26 Pattern A Round 4 - 3:30PM

Room: E3 511

2019 SCJFL 1st Quarter Debate Only Tournament

ASAP

Affirmative: Nova 42 Academy ES

Negative: Academy of Higher Learning CK

Name

PTS (100-70)

Name

PTS (100-70)

Esha Salman

92

Chenya Kwon

94

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? _____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

ELAC

- Aff: Strong Factual voice.
- Great job during the asking questions, correct
 - Way to attack her intentions. The asking for proof or source
 - way to point out the judging criteria regarding morality issues
 - to more in depth with impacts

- Neg: Awesome judge with the structure. You flowed at ease.
- For a 6th grader you made good connections, remember to make the sources down.
 - Have a strong voice and sound more assertive. you will become a strong speaker
 - you have a lot of potential. be with what you know.
- Fully express what you are thinking and feeling.
- Overall great job.
 - remember to provide more proof or examples from a source.

Kevin Kunes - La Reina

100		Sam Velasco - ELAC	
FLIGHT: A		Open LD - Sat 10/26 Pattern A Round 4 - 3:30PM	
Room: E3 517		2019 SCJFL 1st Quarter Debate Only Tournament	
ASAP			
Affirmative: Philharmonic Debate JL		Negative: Academy of Higher Learning OC	
Name	PTS (100-70)	Name	PTS (100-70)
Jeffrey Liu	<u>45</u>	Olivia Cha	<u>90</u>
Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.		Low Point Win? _____	
<u>42</u> <i>Kevin Kunes</i>		<u>La Reina</u>	
JUDGE'S SIGNATURE		JUDGE'S AFFILIATION	

Liu
 Very well organized, helps make sense of the unusual V and VC. A little worried about your definitions. They are wide enough to call a college application with multiple questions a statistical test. Smoking analogy is well placed and aids clarity. I also appreciate how clear the links to impacts were made. Signposts could use a little work, play with tone and cadence to better signal transitions. Not at all impressed with your CX. Not a very good use of questions like "would I win if I..." or "what is your most important point?" These are not decisions you want your opponent making. You notice your opponent's traps just fine and your rebuttles are well organized. Still, you clean drop her third contention about fix's K-12, which she TOLD YOU in cross was her most important contention.

Cha
 Safe V and VC, but I would've liked at least a preview as to where the clash might be. Your point 3 seems to stick out a little. Is it a counterplan? You have a good answer to his point 3, but you need to at least mention points 1, 2 and 4 so I don't think you forgot them, even if you only say "this doesn't matter as much as my point". I see a little bit of that in cross examination, you held your own very well. The 1NR does a great job answering his criticisms of your case, but you need to let the judge know which contention you are talking about and when. Even so you don't intent win on his points about Demotivation or drop out rates or memorization for me to give you the win.

Kevin Kunes - La Reina

94		Sam Velasco - ELAC	
		FLIGHT: B	
Room: E3 517		Open LD - Sat 10/26 Pattern A Round 4 - 3:30PM	
ASAP		2019 SCJFL 1st Quarter Debate Only Tournament	
Affirmative: Academy of Higher Learning WK		Negative: Kudos College of Youth Leadership NC	
<u>Name</u>	<u>PTS (100-70)</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>PTS (100-70)</u>
Wonjong Ko	<u>87</u>	Nathan Chen	<u>86</u>
Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.		Low Point Win? _____	
<u>Kevin Kunes</u>		<u>La Reina</u>	
JUDGE'S SIGNATURE		JUDGE'S AFFILIATION	

Ko

Autonomy as a criterion for Justice is weird but makes lots of sense when you explain it. Points are well laid out if a little vague. Your essay interview plan is concrete, but it feels out of place if you just get done talking about making money while a little sloppy the IAR does a good job of answering everything the Neg brings up. Works on sign posting a little bit so I know where to flow your responses. I buy your framework and your criticism of utilitarianism. Under this criteria your Disability point carries you even though you forget the Neg argument "They can still hear?"

Chen

Work on professional body language and concise language. Would've liked to have seen you mention Bullying in the first ~~affirmative~~ contention. As for the "MALE-SCHOOL-OF-THOUGHT" you do a good job of proving that he doesn't solve the first boys do better on multiple choice tests, but not his main point which is to put less value on multiple choice tests. Really would've liked to see more Value VC stuff on the frame work. You have extra time so you don't need to rush past things like we see. During your rebuttal time you need to address the new arguments the AFF makes not the old arguments the AFF made in the constructive. Overall you are a little too hard to follow for me to confidently say you answered the Affirmative points of the Test emphasizing male schools of thought or any points about Bullying.

92

Eunice Kang - Wilshire

FLIGHT: A

Open LD - Sat 10/26 Pattern A Round 4 - 3:30PM

Room: E3 525

2019 SCJFL 1st Quarter Debate Only Tournament

ASAP

Affirmative: Academy of Higher Learning IK

Negative: Nova 42 Academy CC

Name PTS (100-70)

Name PTS (100-70)

Ian Kim 85

Chloe Chun 84

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win?

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Nova 42 won this round because she clearly stated her impacts. Another reason is because most of her arguments still stood till the very end because there was only one rebuttal.

95

Eunice Kang - Wilshire

FLIGHT: B

Open LD - Sat 10/26 Pattern A Round 4 - 3:30PM

Room: E3 525

2019 SCJFL 1st Quarter Debate Only Tournament

ASAP

Affirmative: Academy of Higher Learning MB

Negative: Kudos College of Youth Leadership
DW

Name	PTS (100-70)
Mihir Bamdhamravuri	<u>84</u>

Name	PTS (100-70)
Daniel Wu	<u>87</u>

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? _____

Eunice Kang
JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

Wilshire
JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Kudos won this round because all of their arguments were standing till the end. Academy of Higher Learning had very good points which could have gave a potential when but make sure to respond to arguements and not bring up any new ones in your last speech

91

Rhinell Navarro - ELAC

FLIGHT: B

Open LD - Sat 10/26 Pattern A Round 4 - 3:30PM

Room: E3 511

2019 SCJFL 1st Quarter Debate Only Tournament

ASAP

Affirmative: Academy of Higher Learning AL

Negative: Nova 42 Academy JJ

Name

PTS (100-70)

Name

PTS (100-70)

Allen Li

No Show

Jeremiah Jung

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? _____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

ELAC

99

Matt Conrad - La Reina

FLIGHT: A

Open LD - Sat 10/26 Pattern A Round 4 - 3:30PM

Room: E3 508

2019 SCJFL 1st Quarter Debate Only Tournament

ASAP

Affirmative: Kudos College of Youth Leadership
JW

Negative: Academy of Higher Learning NH

Name	PTS (100-70)
Julianne Wu	<u>82</u>

Name	PTS (100-70)
Nelson Hu	<u>87</u>

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? No

Matt Conrad
JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

La Reina
JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

- ① Oral critique
- ② Aff FW of util & structural violence is potentially contradictory - another team could go to town on this.
- ③ I vote Neg on better weighing, evidence analysis, & FW debate. Aff spends far too much time in 2AR responding to first neg contention that there's no time left to cover the rest of the Neg case & responses in 2AR are too late.
- ④ Very good young debaters - just keep debating & getting better! 😊

Matthew Schupp

96	Ellie Jiang - Kudos Leadership	
	FLIGHT: A	
	Open LD - Sat 10/26 Pattern A Round 4 - 3:30PM	
Room: E3 457	2019 SCJFL 1st Quarter Debate Only Tournament	
ASAP		
Affirmative: Academy of Higher Learning JP		Negative: Academy of Higher Learning SB
<u>Name</u>	<u>PTS (100-70)</u>	<u>Name</u> <u>PTS (100-70)</u>
Jun-Woo Pak	<u>85</u>	Sansur Borijn <u>84</u>
Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.		Low Point Win? _____
<u>MUS</u>		<u>KUDOS</u>
JUDGE'S SIGNATURE		JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Work on volume and articulation

INC= work on articulation, good organization.
INR= work on organization and flow.

IAC= too much recap. spend time making new arguments.

IAR= good time management.

close debate. came down to neg not having evidence for a new standardized test vs AFF dropping argument about alts to S.T. in the end I buy the harms of S.T. in absence of major positive impacts left out by neg. Neg needs to dedicate time focusing on major reasons why he wins. Both speakers need to apply their value/criterion to arguments. no one applied it, yet both spent a lot of time debating whose was better. AFF wins on firmness of abolition and ~~not~~ lack of positive evidence presented by neg about tests.

98

Matt Conrad - La Reina

FLIGHT: B

Open LD - Sat 10/26 Pattern A Round 4 - 3:30PM

Room: E3 508

2019 SCJFL 1st Quarter Debate Only Tournament

ASAP

Affirmative: Kudos College of Youth Leadership
RX

Negative: Academy of Higher Learning DC

Name	PTS (100-70)
Rachel Xu	<u>80</u>

Name	PTS (100-70)
Daniel Choi	<u>75</u>

Above, **CIRCLE** the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? _____

Matt Conrad
JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

La Reina
JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Matthew Schupp

93

Elie Jiang - Kudos Leadership

FLIGHT: B

Open LD - Sat 10/26 Pattern A Round 4 - 3:30PM

Room: E3 457

2019 SCJFL 1st Quarter Debate Only Tournament

ASAP

Affirmative: Academy of Higher Learning JM

Negative: Nova 42 Academy GR

Name

PTS (100-70)

Name

PTS (100-70)

James Miller

86

Gavin Rossi

85

Above, **CIRCLE** the **SIDE** and **TEAM** that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? _____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Work on time management.

prepare for ~~the~~ weighing
2 pieces of competing
evidence.

good debate by both. Both apply value well.

ZAR = little rushed but good rebuttal overall.

End comes down to which AIts are the least biased.

Neg only attacks one alt out of many and Aff capitalized.

Neg also mishandles rebuttal on college success indicator, giving Aff

slight edge in rebuttals. Aff shows that biases still exist for

S.T. and it is unjust to use a system with so many biases that

84

Ethan Chang - Kudos Leadership

FLIGHT: A

Open LD - Sat 10/26 Pattern A Round 3 - 1:00PM

Room: E3 517

2019 SCJFL 1st Quarter Debate Only Tournament

ASAP

Affirmative: Academy of Higher Learning NH

Negative: Nova 42 Academy ES

Name	PTS (100-70)
Nelson Hu	<u>90</u>

Name	PTS (100-70)
Esha Salman	<u>92</u>

Above, **CIRCLE** the **SIDE** and **TEAM** that you believe won the debate

Low Point Win?

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

AFF

don't say women underperform because of genetics
 don't interrupt the other person when they're giving the order
 respond to all bad

NEG

need uniqueness saying squo sustainable
 need independent offense, most of "NC" is just case defense
 don't get enough of the link turn

rd: neg ~~all about the world~~ goes for purely defense in the 2nd, but doesn't have any offense
 I vote on the chance the aff improves the world by 1% and that testing is biased